Comments on the Coordination of Research and Development

The following is an attempt to summarize my personal views on the interface problem.

- 1. The Problem. Without minimizing the existence of mutual distrust, personality frictions and the like, it is my conviction that the basic problem is not an ORD/TSD interface one but stems from the fact that the Agency has not as yet come to grips with its research and development policy. Any mechanism worked out by the committee would be doomed to failure unless and until the appropriate Deputy Directors are involved at some level in the direction and responsibilities for major R&D programs.
- 2. ORD Responsibilities. ORD should not be responsible for all R&D in the Agency nor should it be made responsible for coordination of R&D. It should, however, provide within its resources R&D support to all directorates in accordance with priorities established by the directorates. Although the bulk of ORD's efforts should probably be directed toward research and exploratory development, there will inevitably be exceptions which suggest that some "moving boundary" of support should be established on a program-by-program basis based upon the technical capabilities of the consumer office. Conversely, other technical offices should not be categorically excluded from undertaking certain kinds of R&D.
- 3. R&D Coordination. The re-establishment of an R&D committee or the establishment of an Agency R&D coordinator or "czar", whether he be in the DD/S&T, the Executive Director's office, or OPPB would be unwise and unnecessary until or unless it has been demonstrated that existing mechanisms are incapable of solving the problem.

| | 4. | Possible | Mechanis | sms. (| ORD and | d TSD sh | ould | under- | |
|---------|---------|-------------|----------|---------|----------|------------|--------|----------|---|
| take a | | li | ke exerc | ise wel | l in adv | vance of | the bu | ıdget | |
| submi | ssion a | t which ti | me these | groups | would | establis | h the | specific | C |
| - | | s for supp | | | | - | | | |
| effort, | and th | ne point at | which O | RD effo | rts sho | ould be tu | ırned | over to |) |

25X1

2

TSD in those cases where it is possible to make this determination. The appropriate technical officers concerned in each area within TSD and ORD should be identified and given the responsibility and authority to interface on a one-to-one basis. The results of this meeting should then be presented to the DD/P and the DD/S&T jointly for their consideration and guidance. After appropriate revision, this joint plan should be presented to OPPB. Certain revisions of the plan, of course, would be required after the budget has been allocated. Progress should be reviewed periodically by appropriate members of ORD and TSD.

- 5. <u>Information Exchange</u>. In those cases where ORD is to undertake R&D directly in support of the Clandestine Services, there must be complete and full exchange of information between the technical officers including previous work undertaken, contractor reports, site visits, and program reviews. ORD should not undertake to support TSD programs where full disclosure cannot be made for security reasons.
- 6. Responsiveness. I assume there will be some situations where ORD will be working in rather basic areas which will not result in operational prototypes. Nevertheless, it is extremely important that TSD provide ORD with the best possible operational feeling for the situation and that a mechanism be established either within TSD or the Clandestine Services generally to provide for orderly and rapid transfer of R&D projects to the Clandestine Services for operational testing and evaluation.

Deputy Director

25X

Οť

Research and Development

25X1